

**REMARKS**

In the Office action, claims 1, 3, 8-10, 14, 28, 29, 31, 37, 42, 43 and 48-50 were rejected as anticipated by Shritic '958; claims 1, 3, 8-10, 28, 29, 31-33 and 35-37 were rejected as being anticipated by Shaneyfelt; claims 2 and 30 were rejected as being unpatentable over Shritic or Shaneyfelt in view of Diaz; claims 11-12 were rejected as being unpatentable over Shritic or Shaneyfelt in view of Fischli; claim 34 was rejected as unpatentable over Shaneyfelt in view of Diaz; claims 39 and 51 were rejected as being unpatentable over Shritic or Shaneyfelt in view of Ribnitz; and claims 4-7, 13, 40 and 41 were indicated as being allowable in independent form.

The independent claims have been amended to recite that a cyclone collects overspray powder from a spray booth and that vacuum transfers powder overspray from a powder outlet of the cyclone to another device. The art of record, particularly Shritic, Ribnitz, Shaneyfelt, Diaz and Fischli make no suggestion of this arrangement. Although the art of record shows the use of cyclones, as is old, none of the references use vacuum to move powder from the cyclone outlet to another container. Powder either falls by gravity or is pushed under positive pressure to another container.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the dependent claims as these claims clearly recite additional patentable subject matter, however, further comment is deferred pending reconsideration of the rejection of the independent claims.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims are allowable over the art of record and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 11, 2005

By:   
Leonard L. Lewis Reg. No 31,176  
(216) 622-8683